ncfr
catalyzing research, theory and practice

WILEY

Marital Status and Wedding Behavior
Author(s): August B. Hollingshead
Source: *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Nov., 1952), pp. 308-311
Published by: National Council on Family Relations
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/348720
Accessed: 31-01-2016 09:44 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

National Council on Family Relations and Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Marriage and Family Living.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 165.123.34.86 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 09:44:19 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

listening to the recording support the impression that John's being henpecked was not so painful in practice as the community gossip would lead one to believe.

Consideration of these contrasting impressions brings forcibly to mind the public nature of the division of labor between husband and wife in a small community. Canning, woodchopping, milking, even Mary's "book-reading" are highly visible. Members of the community who observe John and Mary's deviant allocation of labor appear to evaluate it in terms of their own dominant values with little regard for the way it is regarded by the participants. John and Mary's rationale for their action was known to the community but not accepted as valid. It seems that Mary, although apparently robust, had had one cesarian operation and a history of complications with the birth of each child. This particular Mormon community placed the very highest evaluation on continual activity and industry and did not recognize this type of illness as a legitimate basis for prolonged relief from work responsibilities. In the light of this value, Mary's reading instead of attempting to work changed her status from sick person to malingerer. This undoubtedly influenced the community's appraisal of Mary's marital adjustment.

It is important to stress that the community's evaluation of John and Mary's relations was based upon more extensive observations of their behavior than the present interaction sequence. No systematic study has yet been made of the relationship of adjustment as inferred from problem-solving interaction to adjustment as determined by other measures, and the practical problem of obtaining and analyzing representative samples of interaction is still considerable.

In summary, the findings of this paper complicate the requirements for the evaluation of marital adjustment in two ways:

1) We suggest that samples of decision-making interbehavior have a sufficiently plausible relevance to marital adjustment to warrant further investigation, and
2) We caution investigators who would use community appraisals as a criterion for adjustment to check the correspondence between common values of the community and the value perspective of the family in question.

Marital Status and Wedding Behavior

AUGUST B. HOLLINGSHEAD*
Department of Sociology, Yale University

This paper grew out of the discovery, reported elsewhere,[1] that among newly married couples there is a high positive correlation between previous marital status and the ages of the couple. After this relationship became apparent we asked a related but different question of our data: to wit, are courtship and wedding behavior related significantly to the previous marital status of the individuals involved?

The data used in this discussion were assembled from (1) the marriage licenses of white couples married in New Haven, Connecticut during 1949 and 1950,[2] and (2) 900 personal interviews with couples married in these years.[3] The 900 interviews were a 50 percent random sample by census tracts of couples who were living in the city from three to nine months after marriage. Twenty-eight census-like items such as age, occupation, birthplace, previous marital status, and date of marriage, were available on all cases. Extensive detailed data were collected on the sample interviewed by the use of a schedule.

The interviewed couples were compared with

* Grateful acknowledgment is made hereby to the Social Science Research Council for a grant-in-aid, and the Committee on Bursary Appointments, Yale University, for their support of this project.

[1] August B. Hollingshead, "Age Relationships and Marriage," *American Sociological Review*, 16 (August, 1951), 492-499.

[2] The marriage licenses were copied by permission of the Registrars of Vital Statistics for the State of Connecticut and the City of New Haven.

[3] Data were assembled also on Negro couples, but they are not included in this discussion.

This content downloaded from 165.123.34.86 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 09:44:19 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the non-interviewed ones, census item by census item, to determine if the interviewed sample differed significantly from the non-interviewed group. No significance of difference was found at the 5 percent level for any item. Having satisfied ourselves that the sample was representative of the total group, we proceeded to analyze our data with confidence.

Since we are concerned with answering the question of whether or not there is a relationship between an individual's previous marital status and the type of courtship and wedding behavior he or she exhibits, we must classify individuals in terms of their previous marital status. When *individuals* are viewed from the facet of their previous marital experience they may be divided into two broad groups: (1) persons never married before, and (2) persons who have been married previously. Individuals from these two groups may be combined in four different ways. These combinations may be categorized as follows:

Type I. Both individuals enter matrimony for the first time.

Type II. The man enters matrimony for the first time; the woman has been married before.

Type III. The man has been married before; the woman enters matrimony for the first time.

Type IV. Both individuals have been married before.[4]

Each of these categories will be referred to hereafter as a marriage type. From the viewpoint of the previous marital experience of the woman Type I and Type III are similar, for in each she enters matrimony for the first time. On the other hand, in Type II and Type IV she has been to the altar before. Now that we have defined the criteria for classifying the 1,800 individuals in this study we shall focus our attention on the data to see what effects previous marital status has on selected courtship and wedding behavior patterns.

[4] "Married before" in each case means married at least once; no finer distinctions are made here. Some individuals had been married twice or three times, but for present purposes multiple remarriage cases are included with the single remarriage ones.

Courtship

The courtship process may be said to begin effectively when two individuals, who later marry, meet and start dating one another. With this as our point of departure we were interested in finding first *where,* and second, *how* the couples in our sample met. Where they met is summarized in Table I. Two salient points

Table I. The Percentage of Couples Who Met Under Specified Circumstances by Marriage Type

Place or Circumstance of Meeting	Marriage Type			
	I	II	III	IV
A friend's home	28.7	38.7	39.7	36.9
On the job	12.4	17.7	24.1	36.9
In home neighborhood	12.4	12.9	10.3	10.8
At a dance	12.4	9.7	6.8	4.6
A pick-up	11.9	11.3	8.6	6.2
A blind date	10.9	6.4	3.4	3.1
At school	7.0	3.3		
At church	2.4		1.7	1.5
At a club meeting	1.9		5.2	
Number of cases	715	62	58	65

appear in these data. First, there is no clear-cut relationship between previous marital status and where the marital partners met. Type I is different from the other types in several ways, as a study of Table I will show, but there are only minor differences between the other types. The second point of interest is that the church was *not* a setting where an appreciable percentage of the couples first met. This was surprising in view of the fact that religion is such a powerful factor in the mate selection process.[5]

Some interesting minor points are: (1) single males (Types I and II) are far more likely to "pick-up" their future wives on the street or in some public place than are males who have been married before; (2) blind dates are far more frequent among the Type I cases than the other types; (3) single males met their wives at dances much oftener than males who entered matrimony for a second or third time; and (4) the Type IV couples met on the

[5] See August B. Hollingshead, "Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates," *American Sociological Review,* 15 (October, 1950), 619-627.

This content downloaded from 165.123.34.86 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 09:44:19 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

job in significantly larger numbers than was true for the other types.

When we asked *how* the couple met we found that two out of three Type I couples were brought together through the instrumentality of their friends, or their families. The other one-third reported that they met "by chance," such as a "pick-up," or through their own efforts. These ratios shifted sharply in the other marriage types. Here the percentages who met through friends or family held steady at fifty-five. The elements of chance, or through one's own efforts, contributed the other 45 percent. This indicates that persons who are in the marriage market for a second time rely upon their own resources to meet a possible mate to a greater extent than those without this experience.

The five behavioral traits summarized in Table II show that there are significant differences between the courtship behavior exhibited by the four marriage types. Although each exhibits a characteristic pattern of behavior, the greatest amount of similarity is between Types I and III, and Types II and IV. In the former (Types I and III) the woman entered matrimony for the first time, whereas in the latter (Types II and IV) she had been married before. Our data show clearly that the previous marital experience of the woman conditions most significantly the courtship pattern. This rule holds for most behavioral items. For example, in marriage Types I and III, couples dated before they became engaged or decided to marry, 17.7 and 17.3 months respectively; whereas in Types II and IV, this period was 13.4 months and 12.2 months. However, and this is the crucial point, in the former types the women were single, whereas in the latter ones the women had been married before. When we look at these figures from the viewpoint of the man we see that his marital status has little or no influence on the number of months dated. To be specific, in Types I and II the men are single, while in Types III and IV they have been married previously, yet the number of months dated are significantly different. Therefore, we infer from these differences that the effective factor between Types I and II, also between Types III and IV, which conditions the length of the dating period is the woman's previous marital status.

TABLE II. SELECTED BEHAVIORAL TRAITS ASSOCIATED WITH COURTSHIP SUMMARIZED INTO MEANS OR PERCENTAGES BY MARRIAGE TYPE

Behavioral Trait	Marriage Type			
	I	II	III	IV
No. of months dating before engagement	17.7	13.4	17.3	12.2
No. of months engaged	10.3	6.9	9.0	4.9
Percentage engaged	89.4	69.4	74.1	53.8
Percentage with engagement ring	83.9	59.7	63.8	43.1
Cost of engagement ring	$435	$372	$557	$218

We believe that figures presented in Table II reflect the fact that the romantic complex so characteristic of American culture is built largely around the symbolic figure of the maiden. In this complex, the man pays court to the woman and bows to her wishes.

WEDDING BEHAVIOR

Selected behavioral traits associated with the wedding and attendant festivities are summarized in Table III. Careful study of this table shows that the patterns of behavior revealed in the data on courtship are carried over into the activities connected with the wedding period. In 15 of the 17 behavioral traits listed there is a close similarity between marriage Types I and III, and between Types II and IV. The two exceptions are bachelor parties before marriage, and the percentage of couples in each category who had a single ring ceremony.

The data encompassed in Tables II and III are clear evidence of a cultural configuration associated with each marriage type. Type I marriages comprised 79.4 percent of our sample.[6] This is the most widely approved type in our society for it involves a man and a woman who have never had previous marital experience; the romantic complex is centered around it.

[6] The other types were distributed as follows: Type II, 6.9 per cent; Type III, 6.4 per cent; Type IV, 7.2 per cent.

This content downloaded from 165.123.34.86 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 09:44:19 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

TABLE III. SELECTED BEHAVIORAL TRAITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE WEDDING AND ATTENDANT FESTIVITIES SUMMARIZED INTO MEANS OR PERCENTAGES BY MARRIAGE TYPE

Behavioral Trait	Marriage Type			
	I	II	III	IV
% who had bachelor party	33.7	31.1	13.8	4.6
% who had showers	81.0	27.4	56.9	32.3
No. of showers	1.6	.4	1.0	.4
% with formal wedding	69.7	4.8	29.3	6.2
% with church wedding	81.3	22.6	44.8	24.6
% with single ring	26.4	54.8	55.2	60.0
No. in bridal party	7.2	4.1	4.9	3.5
No. of wedding guests	172.0	34.0	77.0	30.0
% of cases where bride's family paid for wedding	45.7	14.8	23.1	3.1
% having a reception	87.7	51.6	79.3	44.6
No. of guests at reception	166.0	42.0	82.0	23.0
Cost of wedding	$948.0	$348.0	$571.0	$176.0
Value of cash gifts	$527.0	$168.0	$271.0	$ 70.0
Value of other gifts	$978.0	$336.0	$505.0	$182.0
% taking wedding trip	94.5	75.8	79.3	61.5
No. of days on trip	9.0	6.0	9.0	6.0
Cost of wedding trip	$320.0	$254.0	$371.0	$174.0

In Type I marriages the length of courtship, the number and percentage of premarital parties, the form and size of the wedding, its cost and the value of gifts received, are all significantly different from the other types. After the wedding festivities are over, more than nine out of ten Type I couples go on an expensive wedding trip. When a single woman marries a man who has been married before (Type III) she too has a long courtship, and a good sized wedding. However, she is not as likely to receive an engagement ring as her Type I sister, but if she does it is a more expensive one. She will go on a slightly more expensive wedding trip, but she will receive only about one-half as many wedding gifts as the Type I wife.

The courtship and wedding patterns are sharply different when the woman has been married before, from those where she has not. Type II marriages, on the whole, are intermediate with respect to Types III and IV. They are not as large and expensive as Type III, neither are they as small and inexpensive as Type IV. Although the wedding trip is the same length in both Types II and IV, a significantly smaller percentage take a trip among Type IV's; moreover, when they do the trip is less expensive.

We infer that these differences are produced by the differential evaluation that is associated with previous marital status in our society. Type I marriages are the most highly approved; therefore, more ceremonial and ritual are associated with them. The other types are approved, but they involve at least one person who has been married before. This fact results in courtship and wedding behavior patterns that differ significantly from Type I and from each other. When the woman has not been married previously the behavior patterns most clearly approximate Type I even though the man has been married before. However, when the woman has a previous marital history but the man has not, then the behavior pattern more closely approximates that of the Type IV case. When both partners have been married before, the pattern is most deviant from Type I.

By way of conclusion, we shall stress that the close relationships between age and previous marital status reported in an earlier paper provided the concept of marriage types explored here. This concept has proved to be valid insofar as it applies to the various behavioral items we have examined. Clearly there are different patterns of courtship and wedding behavior associated with each type. A future step in this research will be to determine whether or not the concept of marriage type will apply to the family constellation after marriage. Research on this point is now underway.

This content downloaded from 165.123.34.86 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 09:44:19 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions